

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Examiner is thanked for the clarity and conciseness of the Office Action and for the citation of the references which have been studied with interest and care.

#### **Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103/ Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 1-8, 10, 11, 14, 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over HERBERT 6,121,761 in view of McINTYRE 2002/0109415. Claims 15, 22-25 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 10 and 14 have been canceled. Claim 15 has been rewritten in independent form. Claim 1 has been amended to recite limitations similar to those recited in claim 15.

With respect to claim 21, McINTYRE merely provides a generalized teaching of using switched capacitor circuitry to convert a D.C. input voltage to one or more D.C. output voltages. The collective teachings of HERBERT and McINTYRE do not disclose or suggest: disconnectably connecting a multiplicity of switched capacitors in parallel between the node Vs and ground; disconnectably connecting the switched capacitors in series between ground and a node Vout; and connecting a multiplicity of parallel sub-circuits between the node Vout and ground, wherein each parallel sub-circuit comprises a switch, a node Vc, and a small capacitor, wherein the small capacitor is electrically connected between the switch and ground, and the node Vc is between the switch and the capacitor.

MPEP 2143.03 states: To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. For the reasons given above, this combination of prior art falls short of Applicants' invention, and withdrawal of the rejection and the objection is respectfully requested.

#### **Request For Reconsideration Of The Finality Of The Rejection**

"[A] second or any subsequent action on the merits in any application or patent undergoing reexamination proceedings will not be made final if it includes a rejection, on newly cited art, other than information submitted in an information disclosure statement filed under 37 CFR 1.97(c) with the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17 (p), of any claim not amended by applicant or patent owner in spite of the fact that other claims may have been amended to require newly cited art." MPEP 706.07(a).

In the Office Action mailed on August 19, 2005, the Examiner introduced a new ground of rejection that was neither necessitated by Applicants' amendment of the claims nor based on information submitted in an information disclosure statement. The amendment to claim 21 was merely grammatical, namely, adding the word "and" between the final two elements of the claim. For the reasons discussed above, withdrawal of the finality of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUDING REMARKS**

Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Concurrence by the Examiner and early passage of the application to issue are respectfully requested.

Any additional fees which are required in connection with this communication and which are not specifically provided for herewith are authorized to be charged to deposit account no. 500651. Any overpayments are also authorized to be credited to this account.

Respectfully submitted,



October 14, 2005

Peter L. Holmes  
Reg. No. 37,353  
Attorney for Applicants

**HENRICKS, SLAVIN & HOLMES LLP**  
840 Apollo Street, Suite 200  
El Segundo, California 90245-4737  
Telephone: (310) 563-1454  
Facsimile: (310) 563-1460